

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1–60 were in the application as filed. Claims 31–46 and 48–50 were previously canceled without prejudice pursuant to a requirement for restriction, and claims 1, 2, 8, 47, and 56 were previously cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 7, 51–55, 58–60, and 63–65 stand rejected. Claims 3–6, 9–30, 61, and 62 stand allowed. Claim 57 stands objected to as allegedly dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants express their appreciation to the Examiner for the notification of allowable subject matter.

In this paper, claims 7, 51, 52, 55–57, 63, and 65 are cancelled without prejudice. Claims 53, 54, 58, and 64 are amended to depend from allowed claim 62. Claim 57 is rewritten as independent claim 66 to include the limitations of base claim 65 and intervening claims 51, 52, and 55.

The amendments made herein add no new matter. Any amendment to the claims which has been made in this Amendment and Response, and which has not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based on prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to be attached thereto. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 7, 51–55, 58–60, and 63–65 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0163586 of Noguchi in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0098914 of Easwar. The rejection is traversed.

Claims 7, 51, 52, 55, 63, and 65 are cancelled without prejudice, and claims 53, 54, 58–60, and 64 depend from allowed claim 62. Thus, the rejection is moot.

Serial No. 10/710,412
Filed: July 8, 2004
Page 9 of 9

Examiner: Nicholas G. Giles
Group Art Unit: 2622

Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection, and the allowance of claims 53, 54, 58-60, and 64.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, all claims remaining in the application are allowable over the prior art. Notification of allowability is requested. If there are any remaining issues which the Examiner believes may be resolved in an interview, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
ROBERT L. BINGLE ET AL.

Dated: July 7, 2009

/Michael F Kelly/

Michael F. Kelly, Reg. No. 50,859
MCGARRY BAIR PC
32 Market Avenue, SW; Suite 500
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503
Telephone: (616) 742-3500